

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Amendments were made to the specification to correct errors and to clarify the specification. No new matter has been added by any of the amendments to the specification.

Claims 1-25 are pending in the present application. Claims 3-4 and 15-16 were canceled, and claims 1, 5, 13, 17 and 25 were amended. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the interview that was held on November 29, 2006. Applicant's claims were discussed. No agreement was reached.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 101: Claim 25

The Examiner has rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter.

The Examiner states:

The claimed computer program product does not include the computer readable medium storing the claimed instruction means necessary to impart functionality to the claimed instruction means. Thus, the computer program product in the instant claim represents a computer program per se.

Office Action dated September 11, 2006, page 2.

Applicants have amended claim 25 to describe a computer program product comprising: a computer-readable storage medium including computer usable program code for diagnosing errors in a data processing system that includes a computer, which includes a power subsystem and at least one I/O subsystem. Claim 25 now recites a computer readable medium. Therefore, claim 25 is directed towards statutory subject matter.

The Examiner also states:

In addition, were a computer readable medium added to the claim language, the specification does not limit the medium to tangible embodiments (see Specification page 20, lines 8-14) and the claim would thus be considered non-statutory subject matter.

Office Action dated September 11, 2006, page 2.

Applicants have amended the specification to remove the language that describes transmission-type media. Therefore, claim 25 is directed towards statutory subject matter because the claim limits the computer-readable storage medium to tangible embodiments.

Claim 25 is now directed to statutory subject matter. Therefore, this rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation: Claims 1-3, 13-15 and 25

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 13-15 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by *Kosugi et al.*, Computer, System Management Support Apparatus and Management Method, U.S. Patent No. 7,080,285 (July 18, 2006) (hereinafter “*Kosugi*”). Applicants believe this rejection has been overcome by the amendments to the claims and should be withdrawn.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the features of original claims 3 and 4, claim 13 to include the features of original claims 15 and 16, and amended claim 25 to include features that are similar to the allowable features of amended claim 1. Therefore, amended claims 1, 13, and 25 are believed to be allowable because the features of these amended claims are not taught or suggested by *Kosugi*.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-25 has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

IV. Objection to Claims: Claims 4-12 and 16-24

The Examiner stated that claims 4-12 and 16-24 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to add the features of original claims 3 and 4. Therefore, amended claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Because claims 2 and 5-12 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1, claims 2 and 5-12 are also believed to be in an allowable form.

Claim 13 has been amended to add the features of original claims 15 and 16. Therefore, amended claim 13 is believed to be allowable.

Because claims 14 and 17-24 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 13, claims 14 and 17-24 are also believed to be in an allowable form.

Applicants have amended claim 25 to include features that are similar to amended claim 1. Because amended claim 1 is allowable, amended claim 25 is also believed to be allowable.

V. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: December 1, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Lisa L.B. Yociss/

Lisa L.B. Yociss
Reg. No. 36,975
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants